UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/784,659	02/23/2004	Dae-Sik Oh	2621	2345

28005 7590 03/28/2006

SPRINT
6391 SPRINT PARKWAY
KSOPHT0101-Z2100
OVERLAND PARK, KS 66251-2100

EXAMINER	
KIM, WESLEY LEO	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2617	

DATE MAILED: 03/28/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/784,659	OH, DAE-SIK	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Wesley L. Kim	2688	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *09 January 2006*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-22* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-22* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *23 February 2004* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *5/24/04*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

This Office Action is in response to Amendment filed on 1/9/06.

- Claims 1, 10-11, and 22 are currently amended.
- Claims 2-9 and 12-21 are in their original form.
- Claims 1-22 are pending in the current Office Action. This Action is made FINAL.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-22 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. The examiner notes that the prior references are still used in the new grounds of rejection in combination with a newly cited reference, since the amendment to the claims required further search and consideration.

Specification

The examiner notes and accepts the applicants change to the title of the current application, which seems to more clearly reflect the invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claims 1,3, and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Williams et al (U.S. Patent 5475735) in view of Stilp et al (U.S. Patent 5327144) and Graham (U.S. Pub. 2003/0060215 A1).

Regarding Claims 1 and 10, Williams teaches the use of fixed wireless devices (Col.4;1-24, i.e. wireless fixed access units, WFAU) in a wireless local loop radiotelephone system, however Williams **is silent on** comparing a registered location of a fixed wireless device to a current location of the fixed wireless device responsively activating an alert if the registered location of the fixed wireless device does not match the current location of the fixed wireless device and in response to the alert, changing the registered location to match the current location.

Stilp teaches locating a wireless device and comparing it with a predetermined (i.e. registered) location, to activate an alarm if the wireless device is not in the predetermined (i.e. registered) location (Col.19;30-35 and Col.6;3-7). One of ordinary skill in the art could envision applying this general concept of locating a device and comparing the current location to a predetermined (i.e. registered) location and setting off an alarm if the device is not in the predetermined (i.e. registered) location to not only mobile wireless devices but fixed wireless devices.

Graham teaches that it is well known in the art that as a mobile station moves from one cell to another, the cellular phone system updates a record of the MS's current location (Par.4;4-6). One of ordinary skill in the art, would find it

obvious to update the location of a device which has been moved from its registered location, whether it is a mobile or a fixed wireless device.

To one of ordinary skill in the art it would have been obvious to modify Willaims, such that there is a comparison of a registered location of a fixed wireless device to a current location of the fixed wireless device; and responsively activating an alert if the registered location of the fixed wireless device does not match the current location of the fixed wireless device and changing the registered location to match the current location, to provide a method of appropriately routing communications to a devices' most current location after it has been moved from its original location.

With further regards to ***Claim 10***, the fixed wireless device is a wireless local loop hub.

Regarding Claim 3, the combination as discussed above teaches all the limitations as recited in claim 1, and Stilp further teaches performing the comparing function and the activating function in a wireless carrier network (Col.8;23-45 and Col.19;30-35, the location is determined by the cellular system and the registered locations are stored in the database, therefore it is obvious that the wireless carrier network performs the comparing function and the activating function).

2. Claims 2 and 6-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Williams et al (U.S. Patent 5475735), Stilp et al (U.S. Patent 5327144), and Graham

(U.S. Pub. 2003/0060215 A1) in further view of Dupont et al (U.S. Pub. 2005/0037729 A1).

Regarding Claim 2,Williams, Stilp, and Graham teach all the limitations as recited in claim 1, however the combination **is silent on** performing the comparing function and the activating function at the fixed wireless device.

Dupont teaches that a mobile device can obtain a predetermined path and compare it to the current path that the mobile phone is taking and if it is different from the expected then, an alert is sent to an alertee (Par.61). To the examiner a path is a set of allowed location areas.

To one of ordinary skill in the art it would have been obvious to modify Williams, Stilp, and Graham, such that the comparing function and the activating function is performed at the fixed wireless device, to provide a method of lessening the workload off of the network.

Regarding Claim 6,7,8, the combination as discussed above teaches all the limitations as recited in claim 1, and Dupont further teaches wherein activating the alert comprises sending a message to a user, wherein the message is a text message (i.e. email) or a phone call playing an alert announcement to the user (Par.73 and Par.74, user is an alertee).

3. Claims 4,5, and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Williams et al (U.S. Patent 5475735), Stilp et al (U.S. Patent 5327144), and Graham (U.S. Pub. 2003/0060215 A1) in further view of Takahara et al (U.S. Patent 5450613).

Regarding Claim 4, Williams, Stilp, and Graham teach all the limitations as recited in claim 1, and Stilp further teaches that an alarm is activated if a device in not in a predetermined (i.e. registered) location however the combination **is silent on** the alert comprises a visual alert.

Takahara teaches that an alert comprises a visual alert (Abstract, i.e. lights).

To one of ordinary skill in the art, it would have been obvious to modify Williams, Stilp, and Graham, such that the alert comprises a visual alert, to provide a user with an opportunity to see that an alert is activated.

Regarding Claim 5, Williams, Stilp, and Graham teach all the limitations as recited in claim 1, and Stilp further teaches that an alarm is activated if a device in not in a predetermined (i.e. registered) location however the combination **is silent on** the alert comprises an audible alert.

Takahara teaches that an alert comprises an audible alert (Abstract, i.e. sound).

To one of ordinary skill in the art, it would have been obvious to modify Williams, Stilp, and Graham, such that the alert comprises an audible alert, to provide a user with an opportunity to hear an activation of an alert.

Regarding Claim 9, Williams, Stilp, and Graham teach all the limitations as recited in claim 1, and Stilp teaches that an alarm is activated if a device in not in a predetermined (i.e. registered) location however the combination **is silent on** the alert comprises an vibratory alert.

Takahara teaches that an alert comprises a vibratory alert (Abstract, i.e. vibrations).

To one of ordinary skill in the art, it would have been obvious to modify Williams, Stilp, and Graham, such that the alert comprises a vibratory alert, to provide a user with an opportunity to feel an activation of an alert.

4. Claim 11-13 and 18-22 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Williams et al (U.S. Patent 5475735) in view of Dupont et al (U.S. Pub. 2005/0037729) and Graham (U.S. Pub. 2003/0060215 A1)

Regarding Claim 11, Williams teaches the use of fixed wireless devices (Col.4;1-24, i.e. wireless fixed access units, WFAU) in a wireless local loop radiotelephone system, however Williams **is silent on** data storage for storing a registered location of a fixed wireless device; location-determining logic arranged to determine a current location of the fixed wireless device; and alert logic arranged to provide an alert in response to a determination that the current location does not match the registered location and in response to the alert, changing the registered location to match the current location.

Williams teaches that a server of a communication network (i.e. system) comprises means, such as hardware and software elements to operate acquiring an expected path (Par.62;3-5, it is obvious there is data storage (i.e. hardware) for storing a registered/predetermined location(s)), to detected a real path followed by the monitored device (Par.62;6-7, it is obvious there is location determining logic arranged to determine a current location of the device), and to

compare the real path with the expected path to send an alert to an alertee when the real path differs from the expected path (Par.62;7-12, it is obvious there is an alert logic (i.e. software) to provide an alert in response to a determination that the current location does not match the registered/expected location).

One of ordinary skill in the art could envision applying this general concept of locating a device and comparing the current location to a predetermined (i.e. registered) location and setting off an alarm if the device is not in the predetermined (i.e. registered) location not only for mobile wireless devices but also fixed wireless devices.

Graham teaches that it is well known in the art that as a mobile station moves from one cell to another, the cellular phone system updates a record of the MS's current location (Par.4;4-6). One of ordinary skill in the art, would find it obvious to update the location of a device which has been moved from its registered location, whether it is a mobile or a fixed wireless device.

To one of ordinary skill in the art it would have been obvious to modify Willaims, such that there is a data storage for storing a registered location of a fixed wireless device; location-determining logic arranged to determine a current location of the fixed wireless device; and alert logic arranged to provide an alert in response to a determination that the current location does not match the registered location and changing the registered location to match the current location, to provide a method of appropriately routing communications to a devices' most current location after it has been moved from its original location.

Regarding Claim 12, the combination as discussed above teaches all the limitations as recited in claim 11, however the combination **is silent on** a comparator logic arranged to make the determination that the current location does not match the registered location.

Dupont teaches a server of a communication network comprises means, such as hardware and software elements to send an alert to an alertee when the real path differs from the expected path (Par.62). To the examiner it is obvious that the software comprises comparator logic in order to perform sending an alert when the real path differs from the expected path.

Regarding Claim 13, the combination as discussed above teaches all the limitations as recited in claim 12, however the combination **is silent on** a processor, wherein the location-determining logic, the alert logic, and the comparator logic comprise machine language instructions executable by the processor.

Dupont teaches a server of a communication network comprises means, such as hardware and software elements to send an alert to an alertee when the real path differs from the expected path (Par.62). To the examiner it is obvious there is a processor (i.e. hardware) for executing all of the software (i.e. location determining logic, alert logic) and it is well known in the art that the software, written by people, must eventually be translated to machine language for a machine (i.e. processor) to understand the logic.

Regarding Claim 18, 19, 20, the combination as discussed above teaches all the limitations as recited in claim 11, and Dupont further teaches wherein activating the alert comprises sending a message to a user, wherein the message is a text message (i.e. email) or a phone call playing an alert announcement to the user (Par.73 and Par.74, user is an alertee).

Regarding Claim 21, the combination as discussed above teaches all the limitations as recited in claim 11, and Williams teaches the fixed wireless device is a wireless local loop hub (Fig.1;108).

Regarding Claim 22, Williams teaches the use of a wireless local loop hub (Col.4;1-24, i.e. wireless fixed access units, WFAU) in a wireless local loop radiotelephone system, however Williams **is silent on** data storage for storing a registered location of the wireless local loop hub; location-determining logic arranged to determine a current location of the wireless local loop hub; comparator logic arranged to make a determination that the current location does not match the registered location, and alert logic arranged to provide an alert in response to the determination that the current location does not match the registered location and changing the registered location to match the current location.

Williams teaches that a mobile device comprises means, such as hardware and software elements to operate acquiring an expected path (Par.62;3-5, it is obvious there is data storage (i.e. hardware) for storing a registered/predetermined location(s)), to detected a real path followed by the

monitored device (Par.62;6-7, it is obvious there is location determining logic arranged to determine a current location of the device), and to compare the real path with the expected path to send an alert to an alertee when the real path differs from the expected path (Par.62;7-12, it is obvious there is an alert logic (i.e. software) to provide an alert in response to a determination that the current location does not match the registered/expected location).

One of ordinary skill in the art could envision applying this general concept of locating a device and comparing the current location to a predetermined (i.e. registered) location and setting off an alarm if the device is not in the predetermined (i.e. registered) location not only for mobile wireless devices but also fixed wireless devices (i.e. wireless local loop hubs).

Graham teaches that it is well known in the art that as a mobile station moves from one cell to another, the cellular phone system updates a record of the MS's current location (Par.4;4-6). One of ordinary skill in the art, would find it obvious to update the location of a device which has been moved from its registered location, whether it is a mobile or a fixed wireless device.

To one of ordinary skill in the art it would have been obvious to modify Willaims, such that there is a data storage for storing a registered location of the wireless local loop hub; location-determining logic arranged to determine a current location of the wireless local loop hub; comparator logic arranged to make a determination that the current location does not match the registered location, and alert logic arranged to provide an alert in response to the

determination that the current location does not match the registered location and changing the registered location to match the current location, to provide a method of appropriately routing communications to a devices' most current location after it has been moved from its original location.

5. Claim 14-17 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Williams et al (U.S. Patent 5475735), Dupont et al (U.S. Pub. 2005/0037729 A1), and Graham (U.S. Pub. 2003/0060215 A1) in further view of Takahara et al (U.S. Patent 5450613).

Regarding Claim 14 and 15, Williams, Dupont, and Graham teach all the limitations as recited in claim 11, and Dupont teaches an alert comprises text, graphical, or voice messages (Par.120), however the combination **is silent on** the alert comprising a visual alert.

Takahara teaches that an alert comprises a visual alert (Abstract, i.e. lights).

To one of ordinary skill in the art, it would have been obvious to modify Williams, Dupont, and Graham, such that the alert comprises a visual alert, to provide a user with an opportunity to see that an alert is activated.

With further regards to **Claim 15**, it is well known in the art that a light emitting diode (LED) is used to provide a visual alert (i.e. a light).

Regarding Claim 16, the combination as discussed above teaches all the limitations as recited in claim 14, and Dupont further teaches that the alert logic

provides the visual alert by displaying a text message visible on a display (Par.73).

Regarding Claim 17, Williams and Dupont teach all the limitations as recited in claim 11, and Dupont teaches an alert comprises text, graphical, or voice messages (Par.120), however the combination **is silent on** the alert comprising an audible alert.

Takahara teaches that an alert comprises an audible alert (Abstract, i.e. lights).

To one of ordinary skill in the art, it would have been obvious to modify Williams, Dupont, and Graham, such that the alert comprises a audible alert, to provide a user with an opportunity to hear that an alert is activated.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Wesley L. Kim whose telephone number is 571-272-7867. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9:00am-5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, George Eng can be reached on 571-272-7495. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

WLK

GEORGE ENG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER